



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,007	03/11/2004	Chiung-Ying Peng	TOP 275	3886
23995	7590	07/02/2007	EXAMINER	
RABIN & Berdo, PC			CHAUDRY, MUJTABA M	
1101 14TH STREET, NW				
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2112	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/797,007	PENG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mujtaba K. Chaudry	2112	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2007.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1.2 and 5-22 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) 6-22 is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1.2 and 5 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2007 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date . . . . .  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: . . . . .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicants' response was received April 09, 2007.

- Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected.
- Claims 3-4 were cancelled.
- Claims 6-22 are allowable as indicated in previous office action.
- The priority date of March 11, 2003 is granted in light of amendments/remarks.
- The drawings are now acceptable.
- The specification is now acceptable.
- Claim objections are withdrawn in light of amendments.
- Claim rejections under 35 USC 112 are withdrawn in light of amendments.
- Previous art rejections, with regards to claims 1, 2 and 5 are withdrawn in light of amendments and are replaced with new art rejections.

Application pending.

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weaver (USPN 5935268).**

As per claim 1, Weaver teaches a method for generating error detection code of a data sector with sector data information and main data (i.e., Figure 8 and col. 3, line 15), comprising the following steps: generating a first error detection code according to the main data (i.e., Figure 8 and col. 3, line 17); generating a second error detection code according to the sector data information (i.e., Figure 8 and col. 3, line 20); and generating the error detection code by operating the first error detection code and the second error detection code (i.e., Figure 8 and col. 3, lines 31-35); wherein the first error detection code is generated when the main data is read from a host (i.e., Figure 8, reference number 122).

As per claim 2, Weaver teaches, further in view of above rejections, the error detection code is generated by performing an XOR operation on the first and the second error detection codes (i.e., Figure 8 and col. 3, lines 36-40).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weaver (USPN 5935268) further in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).**

As per claim 5, Weaver teaches, in view of above rejections, (i.e., Figure 1) ID data and ID correction data.

Weaver does not explicitly teach the sector data to also comprise of reserve data (RSV) as stated in the present application.

However, AAPA teaches (i.e., Figure 1 and specification, page 1, paragraph 3) that information recorded on a DVD has physical structure including a plurality of data sectors. One data sector comprises 20 comprises reserve data (RSV) 23. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a reserve data in sector data within the teachings of Weaver. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because one of ordinary skill would have recognized that when the optical disc of Weaver is replaced with a DVD, then the sector data would comprise of reserve data (RSV) as is suggested in the AAPA (page 1, paragraph 3) and only the formatting would be effected.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiries concerning this communication should be directed to the examiner, Mujtaba Chaudry who may be reached at 571-272-3817. The examiner may normally be reached Mon – Thur 6:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jacques Louis-Jacques can be reached on 571-272-6962.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Mujtaba Chaudry  
Art Unit 2112  
June 21, 2007

20070621-2112-1007  
Mujtaba Chaudry  
Jacques Louis-Jacques  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100